

REMARKS**I. INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1, 23 and 67 have been amended. Claims 70-72 have been added. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1, 18, 20, 23-27, 66 - 72 are pending in the present application. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable.

II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103 REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

The Examiner has rejected claims 67-69 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,624,329 to Schneebeli ("Schneebeli") in view of U.S. Patent 5,165,688 to Schmidt et al. ("Schmidt"). *Office Action*, ¶ 1, page 2-3. The Examiner alleges that Schneebeli teaches a putter comprising "a grip (Fig. 2A) having an anatomically correct shape to promote proper grasping of the putter." *Id* at p. 2.

Claim 67 has been amended to recite "a grip having an anatomically correct shape to promote proper grasping of the putter, the shape including a first curve having a first radius and a second curve having a second radius, the first radius being larger than the second radius, wherein a portion of the first curve defines an area for placement of a user's thumbs." This recitation is supported by at least Fig. 5 and paragraph [0015] of the present application. The result of the two curves is an anatomically correct shape having no flat surfaces that allows the golfer's hands to rest in a comfortable manner on the grip.

In contrast, the grip illustrated by Schneebeli is comprised of a curved side and a flat side as shown in Fig. 2 A. Schneebeli specifically states that "Fig. 2A shows these grips in cross section, with the non-circular forwardly flat configuration commonly used for putter grips." *Schneebeli*, col. 4, lines 6-8. Thus, Schneebeli neither teaches nor suggests a grip having a "shape

including a first curve having a first radius and a second curve having a second radius, the first radius being larger than the second radius, wherein a portion of the first curve defines an area for placement of a user's thumbs." Schmidt does not cure this deficiency of Schneebeli because Schmidt does not even discuss the grip of a club, it is limited to a discussion of the lower portion of the club.

Furthermore, the applicant has reviewed all the prior art cited in the prosecution of this application and all the prior art either includes a grip as described by Schneebeli or a round grip. Neither of these types of grip teach or suggest the grip as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, neither Schneebeli nor Schmidt, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above described recitation of claim 67. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 67 and all claims depending therefrom (claims 68 and 69).

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1, 18, 23, 24 and 66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,926,913 to Stecher ("Stecher") in view of U.S. Patent No. 1,677,099 to Harness ("Harness"). *Office Action*, ¶ 2, pages 3-4. The Examiner admits that Stecher does not teach a grip having an anatomically correct shape. *Id.* The Examiner attempts to cure this deficiency using Harness. *Id.* The Examiner states that "Harness [sic] teaches the handle 22 with substantially semi-elliptical shape and the flat surface of the handle." *Id.*

Independent claim 1 of the present invention recites a putter which includes "a grip having an anatomically correct shape to promote proper grasping of the putter, the shape including a first curve having a first radius and a second curve having a second radius, the first radius being larger than the second radius, wherein a portion of the first curve defines an area for placement of a user's thumbs." This recitation is similar to the recitation described above for claim 67. Thus, the Examiner's own statement regarding Harness, *i.e.*, that it includes a semi-

elliptical shape and a flat surface, show that Harness does not teach the grip having the shape as recited in claim 1. The grip shape taught by Harness is the same shape as described above for Schneebeli. This shape neither teaches nor suggests the grip shape of claim 1.

Accordingly, neither Stecher nor Harness, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest a putter which includes "a grip having an anatomically correct shape to promote proper grasping of the putter, the shape including a first curve having a first radius and a second curve having a second radius, the first radius being larger than the second radius, wherein a portion of the first curve defines an area for placement of a user's thumbs" as recited in claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom (claims 18 and 66).

Claim 23 recites "a grip for anatomically matching the golfer's hands, the grip including a first curve having a first radius and a second curve having a second radius, the first radius being larger than the second radius, wherein a portion of the first curve defines an area for placement of the golfer's thumbs." Thus, for the same reasons as described above, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 23 and all claims depending therefrom (claim 24).

The Examiner has also rejected claim 20 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Stecher in view of Harness in further view of U.S. Patent No. 3,075,768 to Karns (hereinafter "Karns") and U.S. Patent No. 3,679,207 to Florian (hereinafter "Florian") and U.S. Patent No. 5,489,097 to Simmons (hereinafter "Simmons"). *Office Action*, ¶ 3, pages 4-5. A review of each of these references shows that the grips disclosed in these references either show a round grip or a grip that is the same as described above for Schneebeli and Harness. The Examiner has already admitted that a round grip is not anatomically correct (*See* references to Stecher). As described above, the shape of Schneebeli and Harness do not teach the recitations of either claim 1 or 23. Thus, Karns, Florian, and Simmons fail to cure the deficiencies of

Stecher and Harness because they do not teach the recited grip. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 20 is allowable because it depends from claim 1 and claims 25-27 are also allowable because they depend from claim 23.

9

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Michael J. Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Dated: March 28, 2006

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, NY 10038
Tel: (212) 619-6000
Fax: (212) 208-6819